



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/735,443	12/12/2000	Kary K. Burns	14999.19	5475

7590

09/01/2005

R. Burns Israelsen  
WORKMAN, NYDEGGER & SEELEY  
1000 Eagle Gate Tower  
60 East South Temple  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

EXAMINER

JAMAL, ALEXANDER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2643

DATE MAILED: 09/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/735,443

Applicant(s)

BURNS, KARY K.

Examiner

Alexander Jamal

Art Unit

2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18, 26-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. Based upon the submitted amendment, the examiner notes that claims 1,6,12,13,15,26,32 have been amended.
2. Examiner withdraws the 112 first paragraph rejections to claims 13-15

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-8,10-18,26-29,32**, rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burg et al. (6456699), and further in view of Isensee et al (5815153).

As per **claim 1**, Burg discloses a system for sending and receiving content from at least one server connected to a network (a computer and telephone interface to internet), the system comprising a first access device (standard telephone) with a telephone keypad that signals a voice browser (IVR system) to retrieve specified classes of information (HTML) (Col 3 lines 20-45, ABSTRACT). The system further comprises a second device (computer 84 in Fig. 5) coupled to the network. Burg discloses the system structure in Fig. 5. He further discloses that servers 82 and 85 may be implemented as

Art Unit: 2643

one server with multiple functions (Col 8 lines 55-65). Burg further discloses an embodiment in which a graphical representation of the IVR menu choices are graphically displayed on the computer in a web-page format that allows the user to request information from the same database as the telephone (Col 8 lines 40-60). The IVR server comprises a 'voice browser' portion that converts speech received from the phone into a request signal based upon the user input (voice or keypad) (Col 3 lines 20-26). The request from the voice browser is an HTML code request that is passed to a correlating unit (within server 82 or 85) that correlates the html code with the classes of information stored in the database (Col 7 line 58 to Col 8 line 10). The computer may implement a graphical representation (web page) of the IVR menu structure with icons being associated with classes of information in the same manner as the keys of a telephone keypad are associated with said classes of information (Col 9 lines 5-15). Based upon user input, the computer may send out a request (HTML code) to the web server (via a URL) (Col 8 lines 34-50). Based upon correlation of HTML code requests with the classes of information, the IVR or WEB server (which may be combined as one unit) will access the appropriate classes of information and send them to the requesting device. However, Burg does not disclose that the computer comprises a graphical interface with an icon group arranged similarly to the keypad of the first access device (telephone).

Isensee discloses a graphical user interface for a computer that may be arranged with a set of icons arranged in the same shape as a standard telephone keypad (Col 4 lines 15-26). Isensee teaches that it is desirable to have GUI interfaces on computers appear similar to the situations experienced in real life (Col 1 lines 50-60). Isensee's computers

Art Unit: 2643

inherently comprise software for the purpose of controlling the hardware. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this application that the interface (GUI) of the computer disclosed by Burg could be made to resemble the telephone (including the standard telephone keypad) for the advantage of improving the user interface of the computer.

As per **claims 6**, claim rejected for same reasons as claim 1 rejection. Burg's phone inherently comprises an output device for the purpose of interfacing with the phone user. The servers 82 and 85 (BURG: Fig. 5) provide requests for specific classes of information.

As per **claim 12**, claim rejected for same reasons as claim 6 rejection.

As per **claims 26,32**, claims rejected for same reasons as claim 6 rejection. Additionally, Burg in view of Isensee is implemented on computers that inherently require software for the purpose of controlling the hardware.

As per **claims 2,4,7**, the first access device (telephone) comprises a keypad (display device, or alphanumeric touchpad) on which the user interface is displayed.

As per **claim 3**, claim rejected for the same reasons as the claim 6 rejection.

As per **claim 5**, claim rejected for same reasons as claim 6 and 4 rejections.

As per **claim 8**, in Burg's system, the interface of computer 84 (Fig. 5) is generated by web server 82. Burg in view of Isensee discloses a system in which the computer comprises an improved interface (in the form of a graphical keypad). Since the graphical keypad must be correlated to the HTML links in the webserver for the graphical links to function, the graphical keypad must be inherently generated by the server (where the HTML contents originate from) in order to correlate the icons with the HTML documents (such as during the web translation process in BURG: Col 9 lines 1-6).

As per **claim 10**, Burg's system comprises a telephone (Col 10 lines 30-41) with an outputting device. A speaker is inherent to a telephone for the purpose of allowing the user to communicate (hear) with the network.

As per **claim 11**, Burg's access device comprises a computer system 105 (Fig. 6).

As per **claim 13,18,29**, Burg's system comprises computer 105 (Fig. 6) with an output display device to display the user interface (Col 9 line 62 to Col 10 line 10).

As per **claim 14**, claim rejected for same reasons as claim 12 rejection.

As per **claim 15**, Burg's computer is a WWW browsing capable computer (Computer 105 and Web Server 103 in Fig. 6). As such it inherently comprises a mouse (pointing capable device) for the purpose of selecting graphical buttons and hyperlinks.

As per **claim 16**, in a telephone, the 'selection' of a key is the same as pressing that button on the keypad.

As per **claim 17**, Burg's system works over the internet, as such, a request is transmitted over a network system (Figs. 5,6).

Art Unit: 2643

As per **claims 27,28**, claims rejected for the same reasons as claim 12 rejection.

The keypad of a standard telephone generates DTMF signals.

As per **claims 30,31**, the voice browser converts requested information into speech that is output (via an audio output on the telephone) to the user (Col 3 lines 20-50).

5. **Claims 9** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burg et al. (6456699) and Isensee et al (5815153) as applied to claims 6, and further in view of Bolduc et al. (6157841).

As per **claims 9**, Burg and Isensee disclose applicant's claims 6,26, however they do not disclose the access device (telephone) comprising a display.

Bolduc discloses a telephone that comprises a display and is able to send and receive HTML requests (Col 4 lines 4-20). The HTML code is sent to a voice browser that may convert the HTML code into speech that is output (via an output device) on the telephone (Col 3 lines 15-31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of this application that the access device (telephone) could comprise a display and HTML interface for the purpose of giving the user an expanded interface (the visual display) that can directly interface with HTML documents.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Art Unit: 2643

6. Applicant's arguments filed 8-12-2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per applicants arguments (remarks pages 10-11) that the Burg and Isensee references do not disclose a uniform interface, examiner disagrees. Examiner notes that the computer and telephone interfaces of Burg may be coupled to the same server (claim 1 rejection above). Examiner further notes that Isensee teaches a GUI interface on a computer that corresponds to (presents a uniform interface with) a known telephone apparatus with the use of a set of icons arranged in the same shape as the telephone keypad. The computer of Burg, coupled to the same server as the telephone, with the keypad matching GUI taught by Isensee presents a uniform interface to the user.

As per applicant's arguments (remarks pg. 12) that there is no motivation to combine the Burg and Isensee references, examiner disagrees. Isensee teaches a uniform interface via a GUI that matches the keypad of a telephone (claim 1 rejection above). Examiner contends the motivation to combine the GUI taught by Isensee with the computer system of Burg (cited in the claim 1 rejection above) is valid motivation as the computer interface is more easily recognized and used by the user. Examiner further notes that Burg does not teach away from the combination with Isensee because even if a website is 'previously developed', the presentation of the interface to the user is not limited by the content of the webpage and a GUI emulating a telephone keypad could easily be implemented on the computer of Burg.



Art Unit: 2643

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alexander Jamal whose telephone number is 571-272-7498. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9AM-6PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis A Kuntz can be reached on 571-272-7499. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are **571-273-8300** for regular communications and **571-273-8300** for After Final communications.

AJ  
August 29, 2005

  
**CURTIS KUNTZ**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600